

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

CNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Enited States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Bac 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO	
10/009,353	11/13/2001	Steven G. Corveleyn	55728US002	1999	
32692	7590 06/01/2004		EXAM	EXAMINER	
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427			. RAJGURU, U	RAJGURU, UMAKANT K	
ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
,,			1711		

DATE MAILED: 06/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	10/009,353	CORVELEYN, STEVE	EN G.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Umakant K. Rajguru	1711					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address							
THE REPLY FILED 29 March 2004 FAILS TO PLACE T Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to ave final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appea Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	HIS APPLICATION IN CONDITI roid abandonment of this applica) a timely filed amendment which I (with appeal fee); or (3) a timel	ON FOR ALLOWAN ation. A proper reply h places the applicati	CE. to a on in				
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]						
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire I ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Official of the control of the co	Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE date on which the petition under 37 CF of extension and the corresponding amount the shortened statutory period for reply ce later than three months after the main	g date of the final rejection HE FINAL REJECTION. S R 1.136(a) and the appropent of the fee. The approportionally set in the final O	n. See MPEP priate extension priate extension ffice action; or				
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:						
(a) \(\square\) they raise new issues that would require further	er consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);					
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note b	pelow);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in issues for appeal; and/or	n better form for appeal by mate	rially reducing or sim	plifying the				
(d) they present additional claims without canceli	ng a corresponding number of fi	inally rejected claims					
NOTE: 3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):						
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would		eparate, timely filed a	mendment				
canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	ideration bookson consi	idored but does NOT	nlaga tha				
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: of		dered but does NOT	place the				
 6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered becaraised by the Examiner in the final rejection. 	ause it is not directed SOLELY t	to issues which were	newly				
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims we			nd an				
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected:							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	roved or b) disapproved by t	he Examiner.					
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statemen	nt(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)	· · · · ·					
10. Other:	, , , .						
-							

Examiner thanks the applicant for pointing out a typographical error in the office action of 01/27/2004. which referred to item #6 (of earlier office action of 03/18/2003). The correct item should be #5.

There is no need to restart the period of response because the error is very easily detectable.

Instant claims are directed to a composition.. Recitation, in instant claim 16, "blended with" is a process limitation.. Determination of patentability in "product-by-process" claims is based on product itself even though such claims are limited and defined by process and thus the product in such claim/s is unpatentable if it is same as or obvious from the product of prior art even if prior art product was made by a different process.

James J. Seidleck Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 1700